

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of

Applicant : Dan Thaxton
Serial No. : 10/079,679
Filed : February 20, 2002
Title : DOCUMENT SECURITY PROTECTION ANALYSIS ASSISTANT
Docket : STD 1067 PA
Examiner : Kamal, Shahid
Art Unit : 3621
Conf. No. : 6750

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

COMMUNICATION

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action of April 30, 2008, and is timely in view of the accompanying request for a one month extension of time.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the remarks, below.

The present application relates to a computer-based system for presenting a user with a comprehensive set of security features for a security document, for assisting the user through any potential incompatibilities associated with selected security features, for selecting a combination of security features for a security document, and for determining a document security rating for the document. Examples of such security features used on a printed security document include, but are not limited to, pantographs, screens, tamper protection, flourishes, overt authentication, and covert authentication. The system displays a selection guide for the simple selection of

desired security features for the design of a security document. After the user selects desired security features, the programmable computer examines those selected security features for possible incompatibilities. The computer then presents any potential problems to the user with a description of the concerns. Additionally, the computer provides the user with recommended courses of action to resolve these concerns. Finally, the system provides the user with an assessment of how well the selected security features address the desired goal of the user for the level of security. The computer gives the user a numerical rating, providing a quantified assessment of the security of the document.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. published application Pub. No. 2001/00337309 A1, to Vrain. However, it is applicant's view that the Vrain application reference falls short of the mark, and fails to teach a number of claim elements.

Vrain discloses a computer aided system for designing and ordering customized identification documents, such as for example ID cards, with various security features. While Vrain does teach that an ID card can carry various security features, Vrain does not, however, teach a number of the claimed method steps and claimed elements. Vrain does not teach the concepts of assessing compatibility of various, selected security features. Vrain does not teach evaluating the relative ratings of selected security features. Vrain does not teach developing a security rating for a document. In point of fact, the Vrain reference is relevant only in that it shows a system that has a menu of security features that can be added to an ID badge as a part of the badge design process. It does not provide a rating system to assess security based on the selected security features. Further it does not disclose basing document security ratings on a composite of rating scores for features included on the document.

Turning to claim 1 of the present application, a close review of the Vrain reference reveals that it does not disclose performing any of the four steps of the claim. Claim 1 calls for "processing data relating to selected security features of said

document, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information." The Vrain reference does not disclose security features that have associated "compatibility and relative rating information." The Examiner refers to paragraphs 60, and 62 in this regard, but a close reading of these paragraphs reveals no such information for the security features. Further, the Office Action refers to the Vrain security design feature running on a server. Why this is relevant to the claim limitation, however, is unclear.

Claim 1 specifies "revising said selected security features of said document to resolve any compatibility issues." There is nothing in the Vrain reference about resolving such compatibility issues between security features. The Examiner refers to "Fig. 41," which does not exist, and to paragraphs 0011, 0040, 0046, and 0060. None of the recited paragraphs, however, deal with incompatibility between or among security features. The Examiner's reference to software compatibility has nothing to do with the "compatibility" of the various security features. Compatibility of security features refers to whether security features that are selected for use on a single security document might or might not be capable of simultaneous use. For example, a security coating might not function properly on a particular kind of document, or might not work with a second security feature that requires an uncoated surface or that requires a surface that is coated with a different material. The Vrain reference simply does not address the compatibility of security features.

Claim 1 goes on to recite "evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating of said document." The Examiner points to paragraphs 0021 and 0048 of Vrain, and asserts that badge design guidance data is provided by the Vrain system. In point of fact, the noted paragraphs of Vrain teach nothing other than that badge design guidance data can be securely stored. There is no teaching in Vrain of evaluating relative rating information for the security features, and certainly no teaching of determining a "document security rating" of the document.

Finally, claim 1 calls for "presenting said document security rating of said document" and nothing of the sort is suggested in Vrain. As pointed out previously, the Vrain system does not compute a security rating for a security document. It stands to reason, then, that Vrain also does not present a "report" of such a rating.

It is very clear that the Vrain reference differs significantly in its disclosure from the claimed method in the present application and does not, in fact, disclose anything like the claimed method. The Vrain system stores data about various security features that can be added to an identification card. The Vrain system apparently provides the user with information about the advantages and disadvantages of the various security features. If one of the security features is selected, the Vrain system prompts the user to enter the necessary security feature design data. The Vrain reference does not address the compatibility of the various security features (that is, whether such features can be used at the same time on the same document, and are therefore "compatible"), nor does the Vrain system provide relative rating information (that is, information that rates or scores a document design so that the user can obtain an objective comparison of security).

Claim 20 is directed to a computer-readable medium that is capable of instructing a processor of a computer to evaluate security features of a document and to rate the security level of the document. The Vrain reference does not teach a system that evaluates security features. The Vrain reference does not teach a system that rates the security level of a document. Finally, the Vrain system does not perform the steps that the claimed computer-readable medium instructs a computer processor to perform. These steps are:

- processing data relating to selected security features of said document, said security features each having associated compatibility and relative rating information;
- revising said selected security features of said document to resolve any compatibility issues;
- evaluating said relative rating information of said selected security features to determine a document security rating of said

document; and

presenting said document security rating of said document.

Since the system of Vrain does not perform any of these steps, it is clear that the Vrain reference does not suggest a computer-readable medium that instructs a computer system processor to perform these steps, as called for in claim 20.

Claims 2 - 19 depend either directly or ultimately from claim 1. These claims are therefore patentable over the Vrain reference for the same reasons as addressed above with respect to Vrain. Further, these claims contain additional limitations that are in no way suggested by Vrain. For example, claim 10 provides that "certain said security features are made unselectable based upon received said document design information." There is no teaching of this technique for eliminating the selection of conflicting or inappropriate security features.

It is submitted that all of the claims currently presented in the instant application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve efficiently any formal matters or to discuss any aspects of the application or of this response. Otherwise, early notification of allowable subject matter is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DINSMORE & SHOHL L.L.P.

By /James F. Gottman/
James F. Gottman
Registration No. 27,262

Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
One Dayton Centre
One South Main Street, Suite 1300
Dayton, Ohio 45402-2023
Telephone: (937) 449-6403
Facsimile: (937) 449-6405
e-mail: james.gottman@dinslaw.com

JFG/bab

196696v.1